

REMARKS

The Applicants have reviewed the Office Action dated February 2, 2006 wherein it was stated that the claims were not compliant under 37 CFR 1.121, which responded to the Applicant's bona fide attempt to reply to a Non-Final Office action on October 21, 2005. This amendment, with the following remarks, is a substitute and a replacement for the Applicant's Response and Amendment filed on January 23, 2006 (the first business day after the 3-month response date of January 21, 2005). The Applicants respectfully submit that the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment be withdrawn.

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated October 21, 2005. By virtue of this amendment, claims 1, 9 and 10 are amended, claims 2-4, 6-8, 11-13 and 15-17 are canceled without prejudice, and new claims 22 and 23 are added. The new claims find support in the specification at pages 165-170 and in FIGS. 20-22; therefore, no new matter was added. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims 1, 5, 9, 10, 14, 18, 22 and 23 in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi et al., (U.S. patent application publication 2004/0190857) and further in view of Baugh et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,553) is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and for the following reasons. Claims 7, 8, 16 and 17 have been canceled and the rejection made moot.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that the Owashi reference does not disclose opening input devices and/or ports that are connected to other ports or end users. However, applicants disagree with the Examiner that it would be obvious to modify Owashi to include opening input devices and/or ports as taught by the Baugh reference for the following reason. Baugh discloses a voice communication system that opens input devices and/or ports in order to

use such input devices and/or ports. The method of applicants' invention, on the other hand, opens input devices and/or ports in order that such input devices and/or ports not be used. The input devices and/or ports of applicants' invention are opened in order to block, or inhibit, use of such ports. The second step of claim 1 has been amended to emphasize this point,

"blocking all multimedia content input devices and/or ports that are connected to an end-user system that can receive any part of a multimedia content, to prevent use of all such multimedia content input devices and/or ports"

Therefore, Baugh actually *teaches against* the opening of the input devices and/or ports in the applicants' invention in order to prevent use of such input devices and/or ports. The changes made to the second step of claim 1 find support in the specification at page 168, lines 20-21.

As per claims 5 and 14, these claims depend upon independent amended independent claims 1 and 10, respectively, and because dependent claims recite all the limitations of the independent claim, it is believed that dependent claims 5 and 14 also recite in allowable form. Therefore, applicants believe that the rejection of claims 1, 5, 10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome, and applicant requests that the Examiner allow claims 1, 5, 10 and 14.

The rejection of claims 2 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi et al., and further in view of Uzawa et al., (U.S. Patent No. 4,796,301) is made moot in view of the cancellation of claims 2 and 11.

The rejection of claims 3 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi et al., and further in view of Uzawa et al., (U.S. Patent No. 4,796,301) and Baugh et al., is made moot in view of the cancellation of claims 3 and 12.

The rejection of claims 4 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi et al., and further in view of Baugh et al., and Terho et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,180) is

made moot in view of the cancellation of claims 4 and 13.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Owashi et al., and further in view of Silverbrook et al., (U.S. patent application publication 2005/0218236) is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and for the following reasons. Claims 9 and 18 depend upon amended independent claims 1 and 10, respectively, and because dependent claims recite all the limitations of the independent claim, it is believed that dependent claims 9 and 18 also recite in allowable form.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application and the claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Applicants acknowledge the continuing duty of candor and good faith to disclose information known to be material to the examination of this application. In accordance with 37 CFR §1.56, all such information is dutifully made of record. The foreseeable equivalents of any territory surrendered by amendment are limited to the territory taught by the information of record. No other territory afforded by the doctrine of equivalents is knowingly surrendered and everything else is unforeseeable at the time of this amendment by the applicants and their attorneys.


The Examiner is respectfully requested to direct future correspondence regarding this application to the undersigned attorney at the address below.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 13, 2006

By:


Jon A. Gibbons
Registration No. 37,333
Attorney for Applicants

Fleit, Kain, Gibbons, Gutman, Bongini & Bianco P.L.
551 NW 77th Street, Suite 111
Boca Raton, Florida 33487
Telephone: (561) 989-9811
Facsimile: (561) 989-9812